The Examiner indicates that the movement information signal "is essentially a video resolution control factor. It is inversely proportional to the video quality. A motion image in a video causes the image resolution to decrease, and vice versa. Therefore, the motion information signal reads on the quality indication signal as claimed."

Applicants submit that the Examiner is confusing video quality with video display quality. Motion in a video signal does not affect the quality of the video signal. Rather, it affects the quality of the displayed image, in that in current display technology, in order to reduce flicker in the displayed image, the field rate at the display is increased. However, in the case of motion, this type of processing would produce "judder" on the moving objects. The Drewery et al. patent overcomes this display problem by displaying moving areas of the picture at the standard field rate, and stationary areas of the picture at the double field rate (col. 1, lines 10-39). In order to do this, the Drewery et al. apparatus uses a motion information signal "determined in a known manner and received at an input 116." (col. 3, lines 26-28). Hence, in areas of motion, the display resolution is reduced, while in stationary areas, the display resolution is increased. However, this has nothing to do with the quality of the video signal. It should be understood that the motion information signal quantifies

a characteristic of the content of the video signal but not the quality of video signal itself.

In the subject invention, as claimed, the quality indication relating to the analog picture signal is received with the analog picture signal. The quality indication is described in the Substitute Specification on page 3, lines 1-11 (paragraph [0008]): "Preferably, the first quality indication Q11 is the bit-rate and/or compression ratio and/or the quantization level at which the digital picture signal (used to form the analog picture signal) has been encoded and or other information about the encoding or decoding…." Each of these parameters has a direct bearing on the quality of the analog picture signal.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the subject invention, as claimed, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1-13, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by 

Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611